

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,117	01/31/2001	Paul Haverstock	52817.000159	1148
29315	7590 08/12/2004		EXAMI	NER
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC 12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD			KANG, PAUL H	
SUITE 900	EI HILLS KUAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESTON, V	A 20190	2141		
			DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004	· /

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
S Action Commons	09/774,117	HAVERSTOCK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
TI MAN INO DATE A Min and the second	Paul H Kang	2141
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realized to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Ju</u></li> <li>2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b>. 2b) This</li> <li>3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	action is non-final.  ace except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2001 is/are:  Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction  11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies.</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	»П	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)         Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-6</u>.     </li> </ol>	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 2141

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. Claims 21-40 are now pending.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 21-40 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 and 1-18 of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,064,977 and 6,301,621, respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the context of the present claimed invention is similar to that of the patented application.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2141

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 3. Claims 1-5, 9-13 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higley, US Pat. No. 5,790,793 (herein referred to as Higley) in view of Sankar, US Pat. No. 5,867,822 (herein referred to as Sankar).
- 4. As to claims 21, 27, 33 and 39, Higley teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Higley teaches a server system providing integrated scheduling and calendaring capability comprising:

a server (Higley, col. 5, lines 1-53);

at least one database associated with the server (Higley, col. 5, lines 1-53);

at least one non-markup language object stored in the at least one database

wherein the server:

(Higley, col. 5, lines 1-53); and

- i) receives a request for the at least one non-markup language object (Higley, col.5, lines 1-53);
- ii) retrieves the at least one non-markup language object requested (Higley, col. 5, lines 1-53); and
- iii) translates the at least one non-markup language object to at least one markup language object (Higley, col. 5, line 54 col. 6, line 8).

However, Higley does not explicity teach the non-markup language object comprising scheduling and calendaring information for at least one user. In the same field of endeavor, Sankar teaches a system for managing electronic calendars and events

Art Unit: 2141

throughout an enterprise (Sankar, col. 4, line 1 - col. 5, line 8). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the scheduling and calendaring system of Sankar into the system of Higley for the purpose of integrating legacy system by translating non-markup language objects to markup language versions.

- 5. As to claim 22, 28, 34 and 40, Higley-Sankar teaches the system wherein the at least one markup language object is displayed using a browser (Higley, col. 5, lines 1-53).
- 6. As to claim 23, 29, 35, Higley-Sankar teaches the system wherein the server comprises a server module, an interface module comprising a markup lanauge to non-markup language translator, and a non-markup lanauge database server module (Higley, col. 5, lines 1-53).
- 7. As to claim 24, 30, 36, Higley-Sankar teaches the system wherein the server module comprises an HTTP server (Higley, col. 1, lines 8-35).
- 8. As to claim 25, 31, 37, Higley-Sankar teaches the system wherein the server is operable to receive a URL based request for the at least one non-markup language object from a browser, and determine a location of the at least one non-markup language object

Art Unit: 2141

(Higley, col. 2, line 14 - col. 3, line 34).

9. As to claim 26, 32, 38, Higley-Sankar teaches the system further comprising a passing module that passes the at least one markup language object to a browser (Higley, col. 2, line 14 – col. 3, line 34 and col. 5, lines 1-53).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul H Kang whose telephone number is (703) 308-6123. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul H Kang /
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2141